

*Draft* Salmon Habitat Plan: Tracking Form for Comments

Questions: What projects, programs, or policies in the draft Habitat Plan do you **DISAGREE** with?  
**WHY** do you disagree?  
How would you **CHANGE** the action to make it acceptable?

Green/Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9)  
March 10 – April 25, 2005

Please use a separate row for each comment.

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • <b>Editorial</b> • <b>Substantive</b>	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Lakey, Kirk, WDFW 3/23/05	2-25	Section 2.10 (Table 2-3)	The Document Road map would be more useful if it were located sooner in the document.			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	3-11, 3-14		3-11,3-14 do not fully discuss in stream flows. Also, there is no reference to existing water management activities. Is the existing instream flow consistent with salmon recovery? If so, how often is the instream flow met? According to a 1995 assessment, water allocation has increased from 5 cfs to 40 cfs in a 25-year period?(Science Applications Int. Corp. et.al. in partnership with WA Dept of Ecology, Green-Duwamish			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				Watershed Initial Assessment, February, 1995)How is this trend affecting stream flow and what can be done about it?			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	4-3		p.4.3 The two last objectives concern flows. However, they are too vague. Objectives without such as this are basically meaningless. How will they play into a meaningful adaptive management regime?			
	Tibeau, Duane, mailed comments, received 3/30/05	4-11	H.H. Dam [UG-1]	Building any kind of fish ladder on Hanson dam is a waste of time and money.	editorial		
	Lahey, Kirk, WDFW 3/23/05	4-11	Section 4.5 Conservation Hypotheses – UG-1 (Tier 1)	This CH is misleading and incomplete and overall not a good idea. It is recommending the out-of-basin introduction of a highly modified and domesticated salmonid. It also states that it is the re-introduction, when it should be "... the introduction of an out-of-basin spring Chinook to replace the extirpated Green River spring Chinook." Because a decision HAS been made, in the <i>Note</i> following CH UG-1 it should also include the decision of these agencies concerning the passage of salmonids above HHD.			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				This recommendation of What is Missing concerning the note should also be included in UG-3 (Tier 2).			
	Hickey, Paul, TPU, 4/1/05	4-11	UG-1	This Conservation Hypothesis does not acknowledge the June 8, 2004 letter from NOAA-Fisheries to Tacoma Water advising that their preliminary recommendation is for Tacoma Water to pass upstream of Howard Hanson Dam all natural and hatchery-origin chinook, coho, sockeye, pink and chum salmon, cutthroat trout and natural-origin steelhead. It also does not acknowledge that the fisheries co-managers manage Green River salmon as integrated rather than segregated stocks. The recommendation that White River spring Chinook be transferred to the Green River needs analysis by management agencies with expertise and jurisdiction. It's unclear whether each, or just the first, of the three alternative hypotheses in UG-1 ranks as Tier 1.			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	4-12		P.4-12 There is no bullet for water quantity.			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	4-16		p. 4-16 The Necessary Future Conditions for water quantity should include some actual numbers and			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				targets.			
	Hickey, Paul, TPU, 4/1/05	4-16	MG-6	This Conservation Hypothesis is not a good idea because it would potentially put Tacoma's water supply at risk of contamination from decaying salmon carcasses. It also ignores NOAA-Fisheries June 8, 2004 recommendation that both hatchery and natural spawning chinook be passed upstream of Howard Hanson Dam.			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	4-20		P4-20 The first bullet in Necessary Future Conditions is good. However, it would benefit from more context. How about the King County normative flow project? Is this contained in the Strategic Assessment?			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	4-23		P4-23 Duw-6 Where is water quantity? Is water quality a surrogate? The same comment is for the first Necessary and Future Conditions on that page.			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	4-28		p-4-28 Water Quantity and Water Quality. Again we would like to see more analysis. This discussion should acknowledge that the situation is deteriorating. However, if the flow is not adequate where and why not? More importantly, where are the			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				program actions to address this problem?			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	4-31	All-4	p-All-4. In our view, this hypothesis is a bit vague. Could this statement be made clearer for the average reader? To the untutored, it seems to say, low flows-high flows, whatever. What program actions does this connect to later in the document?			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-3		The policy discussion is totally inappropriate in that appears to dictate to other jurisdictions the approach and conclusions incorporated by King county in it recent CAO update. Disagree that <i>any</i> of the recommendations contained in this Plan are "mandatory" "imperative" or "non-discretionary." Such a characterization implies a legal structure that simply does not exist. To imply otherwise is, at best, misleading. See, how this plays out on page 6-7, where (for example) local governments are told that they SHALL develop land use regulations to support the priority actions. This is not accurate or appropriate and is also at odds with the discussion re: local commitments in Chapter 8.3			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of	6-4	LU1	Policy not applicable to most jurisdictions that are in the urban			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., “Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Seattle, 4/4/05			growth area.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-4	LU2 Table 6-1	The intent of this table is good, in terms of providing a sense of “what better looks like”, and—because it represents targets only (not requirements)—some ideas on specific elements to improve conditions. But I found myself somewhat confused with what it was trying to tell me.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-4	LU2	As a goal the Target for Good Habitat Quality (Table 6-1) is acceptable, but it not realistic within the Urban Growth Boundary, especially in the already highly urban areas. The existing land use in these areas have already resulted in habitat changes that cannot be reasonably reversed and converted to Good Habitat Quality. Change this to more of a goal statement or recognize that the Target for Fair Habitat Quality may be all that can be achieved in our already highly urbanized areas.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-4	LU2	Table is not applicable to all areas of WRIA 9.			
	Hickey, Paul, TPU, 4/1/05	6-5	LU 8 B	Areas of the Green River upstream of the Tacoma Diversion do not need special land use designations and regulations. These areas are already			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				protected by Habitat Conservation Plans, the US Forest Service Forest Plan and WA DNR Forest Practice Regulations.			
	Nix, Aaron, City of Auburn, 4/1/05	6-5	LU3	These are unrealistic expectations within the urbanized areas of WRIA #9. Low impact development can potentially get us moving in this direction, but is still new and untested within an urban context. We are very excited about the prospect of this new way of development and what it might mean to this action, but more research is needed. 65% forest cover is impossible to obtain especially in the context of meeting current GMA mandates.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-5	LU3	It is unclear if the entire existing WRIA 9 area is currently at 5-10% imperviousness or not. The policy suggests that it is by using the terminology "Maintain", but it is hard to believe that the WRIA is currently only 5-10% impervious. This standard is not realistic for the Urban Growth Area. Increasing storm water standards and changing practices will offset the change in runoff due to increased imperviousness from changing land use, but cannot reasonably be used to return a built			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				environment back to natural conditions.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-5	LU3	Not appropriate in areas served by stormwater drainage systems. The only place where these recommendations are backed by any scientific foundation is small streams. There is insufficient evidence to show that such actions are necessary for salmon recovery anyplace else. Therefore, it should NOT be a WRIA-wide policy that would apply in the lower Duwamish and Marine Nearshore areas.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-5	LU4	This policy in not realistic for the Urban Growth Area. The Urban Growth Area cannot absorb the higher densities and provide 65% natural forest cover in each stream basin. Revise to make this policy apply to the areas outside the Urban Growth Boundary. Is this policy even needed since King County has pass this standard as a Critical Area Ordinance regulation?			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-5	LU4	Not applicable to developed jurisdictions. The only place where these recommendations are backed by any scientific foundation is small streams. There is insufficient evidence to show that such actions are			



#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				necessary for salmon recovery anyplace else. Therefore, it should NOT be a WRIA-wide policy that would apply in the lower Duwamish and Marine Nearshore areas.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-5	LU5	In urban areas with density greater than R-4—which in many cases are required in order to comply with the Growth Management Act—this policy is not realistic. Revise the first part of the policy to read as follows: Local jurisdictions should adopt Low Impact Development techniques to encourage the reduction of stormwater runoff from new construction where feasible. This revision is needed to recognize land use and development regulations have to allow the use of LID techniques.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-5	LU6	This policy is too general. It cannot be applied to every stream and every situation. In some cases it may not be feasible to install a bridge or arched-culvert due to the size of the stream. Revise to be read as follows: Identify and prioritize culverts for replacement. Replace culverts with bridges, 3- sided box culverts or arch culverts that have natural streambed material where feasible, and			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				depending on the size and quality of the stream. Even WDFW will allow the use of a round culvert, especially if you can place spawning gravel in the bottom of the culvert. The policy could state the culvert replacements must be done in accordance with WDFW standards for fish passage and culverts design of stream crossings.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-5	LU8	The policy does not recognize competing land use objectives. There is inadequate technical justification for policy C statement of 65%. Policy E. is vague and in conjunction with "shall" makes the policy untenable when balancing land use objectives. What does "below the dams" mean? Anywhere below the dams, or just right below the dams? If based on the same science as LU4, then (as discussed above) this is wholly inappropriate as applied in lower Duwamish and Marine Nearshore areas.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-6	I1	Instead of saying that SRFB funds shall not be sought to implement Green/Duwamish Ecosystem Restoration Projects (ERP) due to federal funding matching limitations, maybe the policy should say that the			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				federal funding matching limitations should be revised to allow SRFB funds to be used as ERP matching funds.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-6	LU 11	King County issue only.- should not use this document to attempt to further advance this position. Need to recognize that other jurisdictions have their own Comp plans and growth targets.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-6	LU10	This policy is too technical. The average reader will not have any idea of what the policy is intended to accomplish. Revise to be more understandable and to provide better guidance.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-6	LU10	This is nonsensical when expressed as a policy. The statement merely reflects an assumption the Steering Committee is adopting to inform its planning and thinking – it is not a policy but a current planning assumption. See comment below re Science and page 2-16.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-6	LU11	I'm not sure how this policy relates to city plans. Revise to read: "Adopt local land use plans which support GMA growth target allocations and Urban Growth Area designations."			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton,	6-6	LU12	Do any cities have Farmland Preservation Program properties? If			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	4/4/05			so, this policy needs to be revised to reflect that.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-6	LU7	Minimize ground water withdrawals is too vague and general of a statement. Revise to read as: Encouraging water conservation and reuse to minimize ground water withdrawals.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-6	LU8	This policy needs more specificity on what the spatial structure goals are. It is also unclear what would be required to attain at least 65% of historical habitat patches for Chinook spawning and rearing (what and where).			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-6	LU9	This policy is too technical and it is unclear as to what it is intended to accomplish. Rewrite to read as follows: Achieve Diversity and Productivity targets by recovering and protecting historical habitat types, patches and some of their quality in the Duwamish estuary transition habitat, Lower Green River, Duwamish estuary, marine nearshore habitat; and Middle Green/Lower Green spawning habitat. Also, this policy references section 7.4.6 of the Strategic Assessment, but it should be included in this document, or within the appendix.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of	6-6	LU9	Unworkable and vague policy. The policy pretends to be science based			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Seattle, 4/4/05			but include nearshore focus even though this was not listed in Table 5-1 – delete reference to nearshore.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-7	I10	Revise policy by deleting the portion that references the watershed utility. The watershed utility could be one of the funding ideas that will be on the table for consideration, if the local governments support it. It is only one option, however and should not be given preference over other funding ideas. The watershed utility funding idea should not be given special attention in this policy ahead of other ideas. All funding ideas should be reviewed, along with their advantages and disadvantage before selecting the preferred ideas. The concept of creating a new fee for property owners is concerning. There is only so much capacity for new fees or increasing taxes, but there are many priorities, some of which the public may consider to be more important than what this Plan intends to accomplish.  See comments on I9 regarding others who should be involved in developing a funding strategy.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton,	6-7	I4	The current governance structure (Forum/Steering Committee) may be			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	4/4/05			acceptable for plan implementation. The Steering Committee may need to be re-organized and refreshed. The role of the Steering Committee will need to be re-defined, but still would be advisory to the Forum. This policy could be broadened to confirm that a basin-wide governance structure will be needed for implementation (whether or not it is through this ILA). It is unclear whether the Forum and Steering Committee are the best vehicles for implementation.			
	Nix, Aaron, City of Auburn, 4/1/05	6-7	14, 110	We whole-heartedly disagree that another beaucratic mechanism should be established in order to implement the habitat plan. Each jurisdiction, as well as business, utilities and others, have and are investing significant resources for the sake of saving salmon. Much of this investment is driven by other rules, regulations and programs (i.e. Clean Water Act, SEPA, market demands, etc.). We believe that it is unrealistic, especially considering the current state of affairs in Washington State, that a utility would be welcomed by constituents already fed up with the current taxation system. More commitment			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				should be geared towards acquiring <b>federal support</b> and established programs at the local level.			
	Nix, Aaron, City of Auburn, 4/1/05	6-7 6-8	I5, R1	Land use regulations currently supported by the habitat plan are unrealistic and do not take into account current land practices. The 65/10 rule may be appropriate for rural parts of King County, but are devastating to more urbanized areas. Much more work is needed in this area prior to submitting the plan to Shared Strategy and NOAA fisheries.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-7	I7	What is a functional land use plan?			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-7	I8	How does annexing an area within the UGA affect the consistency with and support of the WRIA 9 Habitat Plan? Annexations and incorporations are not relevant—land use is, and it is already addressed in an earlier policy. This policy should be deleted.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-7	I9	The support to examine funding options and identification of action priorities cross-Puget Sound has to involve many others then just WRIA 9 local governments. The State and Federal government will need to be involved also, especially when funding is discussed. Other funding			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				sources such as non-profit organizations and corporation should also be included.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-7, 6-8	I4 through I12	See comments on page 6-3 re: use of term "shall." We will provide further comments regarding implementation with our final comments.			
	Taylor, Bob, Covington Water District, 4/1/05	6-7, 8-17	I10	Covington Water District does not support the creation of a watershed utility. It would be better to work through existing districts, utilities and agencies to accomplish funding needs than to create another level of government and taxation.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-8	I11	Other possible funding sources (State, Federal, non-profits, corporations, ect.) should also be identified has having a role in this policy.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-8	I12	Other possible funding sources (State, Federal, non-profits, corporations, ect.) should also be identified has having a role in this policy.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-8	R1	We disagree strongly with this recommendation. We and others (the Urban Caucus) fought this during the TriCounty process, and we still disagree and consider it to be bad policy. As discussed <i>ad nauseum</i> at that time, and as summarized above, there is simply no credible scientific evidence that these standards are			



#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				appropriate in any areas except small streams.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-8	R1	Revise the policy to read as follows: Adopt increased storm water standards, including low impact development techniques to manage storm water from new development and redevelopment. The 65% forested and 10% impervious limit is not applicable in the Urban Growth Area. If necessary have a separate policy for this that only applies to the rural area or incorporate it into the revised LU3 and LU4.			
	Taylor, Bob, Covington Water District, 4/1/05	6-9	R2	The concept of critical evaluation of new road and infrastructure projects is essential. However, the statement "clearing and grading within landslide hazard areas should be prohibited" is too prohibitive. The word prohibited should be changed to minimized or mitigated in order to facilitate critical infrastructure projects if needed.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-9	R2	To prohibit new road and infrastructure improvements except where necessary for public health and safety is too onerous. There may be a situation where there is no other feasible alternative from a physical and a cost perspective, but to construct the road or infrastructure			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				improvements within landslide hazard areas (i.e. S 277 <sup>th</sup> St project, Pipeline 5 project). Every effort should be taken to avoid and minimize work in these areas and then mitigate for any impacts associated with the work. The need to insure adequate transportation service and infrastructure to serve the Urban Growth Area is also important.			
	Kalhorn, Susie, VMI Comm. Council, 4/1/05	6-10	Education and Stewardship	<p>I'm sorry if I'm a broken record. I think we need to be clear where we are providing information, where we are conducting education, and where we are marketing. All of these components are valuable and an important part of environmental policy implementation.</p> <p>I see the value of "community-based social marketing," when we clearly are focusing on one-way communication. When we need to have two way dialogue and mutual education we should leave our marketing hat at home and be open to new ideas.</p> <p>I think we all know this, but too often marketing is confused with education. I think this section of the plan could be improved by giving examples of how and when these different outreach</p>			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				techniques should be used.			
	Vashon/ Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-10	Education and Stewardship	<i>"Community-based social marketing" is okay but it needs to be described in a more understandable way. The terminology is bad.</i>			
	Hickey, Paul, TPU, 4/1/05	6-11	UG1 UG2 UG3	Non-federal forest landowners are already required to implement provisions of the WA Forest and Fish Report. These provisions to protect fish and wildlife while allowing landowners to manage their forest resources were developed over several years by a comprehensive range of interest groups, and are now incorporated into the WA DNR's Forest Practice regulations.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-12	LG1	Ok, but flood protection that exists cannot be compromised.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-12	NS1- NS4	Are there any recommendations for the Duwamish sub-watershed?			
	Arntz, Dee WEC	6-19	WW-4	Delete the recommendation to modify the Shoreline Management Act.	substantive		
	Arntz, Dee WEC	6-22		P- 6-22 It is our understanding that there are Health Department rules under development.			
	Nix, Aaron,	6-27	WW-1j	Based on our calculations, the			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	City of Auburn, 4/1/05			addition of basin stewards, ILA staff, etc. could total in excess of 1 million dollars annually for WRIA 9. The perceived benefit from this notion is lost in the work that is already being completed by local governments and King County. Significant resources are already geared towards the same types of responsibilities that basin stewards would be tasked to do. It is our perception that individuals with a vested interest in their jurisdiction will do a more cost efficient and effective job of this work.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-27	WW-1j	Too many basin stewards recommended. The existing number of stewards should be sufficient for the work required.			
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-31	WW-4	The text for the policy is acceptable; however, the linkages box on page 6-32 goes into subjects such as minimization of overwater structures. These are troubling linkages with the recommendations on the previous page to amend the shoreline act and/or programs. The Shoreline Management Act is a means to balance competing uses on the shoreline. Making it easier to accommodate a reasonable mix of uses is desirable. However, it is			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				inappropriate for the plan to direct jurisdictions to make one management decision over another.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	6-32	WW-5	Low impact development is not feasible everywhere and only reduces runoff for smaller events but provide small benefits for during larger storms. There are problems with LIDs, with respect to insuring that the property owner does not eliminate the measures over time. This creates an increased code enforcement cost to the local jurisdiction without significant benefits. By using LIDs where feasible the cost of storm water management systems (flow control and water quality) can be reduced to some degree, which benefits the developer.			
	Tibeau, Duane, mailed comments, received 3/30/05	6-39	River Mile 61 [UG-1]	Tricking fish around the two Tacoma dams [sic] is a waste of time and money.	editorial		
	Botts, Howard, Mayor, City of Black Diamond, letter dated 8/26/04	6-39	UG-1	<i>Do not open fish access to three miles of the Green above Tacoma Headworks.</i>			
	Mayer, Dick, President,	6-39	UG-1	<i>Do not open fish access to three miles of the Green above Tacoma</i>			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Lakehaven Utility District Board of Commissioners, letter dated 8/26/04			<i>Headworks.</i>			
	Mayer, Dick, President, Lakehaven Utility District Board of Commissioners, letter dated 8/26/04	6-39	UG-1	<i>Concern about limiting access above Howard Hanson Dam to natural origin fish.</i>			
	Nelson, Judith, President, Covington Water District, letter dated 8/27/04	6-39	UG-1	<i>Do not open fish access to three miles of the Green above Tacoma Headworks.</i>			
	Nelson, Judith, President, Covington Water District, letter dated 8/27/04	6-39	UG-1	<i>Concern about limiting access above Howard Hanson Dam to natural origin fish.</i>			
	Hickey, Paul, TPU, 4/1/05	6-39	UG-1	This action doesn't acknowledge the June 8, 2004 letter from NOAA-Fisheries to Tacoma Water advising that NOAA's preliminary recommendation is for Tacoma Water			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				to pass upstream of Howard Hanson Dam all natural <u>and hatchery-origin</u> chinook, coho, sockeye, pink and chum salmon, cutthroat trout and natural-origin steelhead. It also doesn't acknowledge that state and tribal fisheries managers manage Green River salmon as integrated rather than segregated stocks. The recommendation that White River spring Chinook be transferred to the Green River needs analysis by management agencies with expertise and jurisdiction. A statement should be added to this action informing the reader that the decision on which fish to pass upstream will be made by the co-managers (Muckleshoot Tribe and WDFW) and Services (NOAA-Fisheries, US Fish and Wildlife Service).			
	Parker, Martha, Renton resident, 10/12/04 public meeting	6-47 to 6-56	Multiple Middle Green	<i>Do not introduce unsecured large woody debris (logs) into the Middle Green; LWD moves downstream and can kill boaters</i>			
	Public meeting comment, 3/23/05	6-61 to 6-69		<i>The Lower Green levee setback proposals may not be on the most effective side of the river if they are on the outside bend where erosive forces are greatest. Demonstrate the logic behind the sites</i>			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				<i>chosen.</i>			
	Public meeting comment, 3/23/05	6-65 or 6-69	LG 45 or LG 52	<i>How feasible is the Horseshoe Bend project since the road is on the levee? Consider the water line and other infrastructure and soil contamination remediation costs. Are the costs too great for implementation?</i>			
	Tukwila property owner, public meeting comment, 3/22/05	6-76	Duw-16	<i>Do not support second phase of Duw-16 (purchase of homes and layback of bank east of 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave. S.)</i>	substantive		
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-78 & 6-79	Duw.30 also Duw 44/27	Focusing the Maintenance Dredging program on the Turning Basin, as done at present, provides a deep, wide area for the river to reduce its velocity and settle out a large portion of the sediment load. This precludes the need to dredge long reaches down stream. Not dredging the river is not an option given its commercial maritime uses – the only questions are where you dredge, how often, the associated costs, and whether the dredged material is clean or contaminated. The present approach keeps the area around Delta Marine, and slip 6 commercially viable for ship traffic, because their navigation depth is not			



#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				<p>cut off by the sediment load from every high storm runoff event. To effectively maintain the channel depth north of the Turning Basin, without having to dredge more often and be ready to dredge on very short notice after heavy sediment/storm events (which poses severe cost, permitting, and equipment availability obstacles), you would have to cut another settling basin in the banks and flats immediately upstream of the location you proposed as the new head of navigation. The gain at the turning basin would be lost immediately downstream.</p> <p>Also the "Shallow Water Habitat Creation at Hamm Creek erroneously states that it would have greater habitat value if the head of navigation was moved downstream. That idea ignores the fact that a settling basin would have to be cut in this area if navigation was moved downstream to Delta Marine and Slip 6. Finally, dredging at the current location allows dredging of clean material, prior to it entering the Duwamish Superfund site where it would mix with contaminated sediments in certain areas, be subject to recontamination, etc.</p>			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Grotheer, Wayne, Port of Seattle, 4/4/05	6-81, 6-94, 6-97,	Duw-37, NS-4, NS-6	All of these projects are located in whole or in part on Port of Seattle land – there are no present plans which would preclude these projects but there is also no present funding to implement these projects. The Port of Seattle wishes to maintain future control over decisions affecting its land. These points should be made clear in the report.			
	Dean, Tom, Vashon Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-89	NSP-2: Soft Armoring	<i>Soft armoring is not a good practice. It may be better or faster in terms of permitting simply to move a house.</i>			
	Larsen, Doug, Vashon Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-92	NSP-4: Failing Septic	<i>Cost is still the greatest barrier to fixing septic systems.</i>			
	Vashon/ Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-92	NSP-4: Failing Septic	<i>People would be more willing to fix failing septic systems if they had a wider range of options. There are new technologies that the County health department does not allow.</i>			
	Vashon/ Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-92	NSP-4: Failing Septic	<i>In outer Quartermaster Harbor, a team went door-to-door to talk with residents about fixing their septic systems. This is a model.</i>			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Compton, Roger, Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Raab's Lagoon was at 8 foot level for 50 years but has recently been reduced to 7 feet due to change in the weir. The marine life has consequently changed. Conditions change and the water can be very fresh at times. There is a high level of wave energy that could destroy construction/restoration.</i>			
	Compton, Roger, Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Decades ago, there was almost no vegetation around Raab's Lagoon so it's better than it was then.</i>			
	Tom Dean, Vashon-Maury Island Land Trust, 4/1/05 email	6-94	NS-64	I do not think the Raab's Lagoon project should be a high priority. In fact, I would take it off the list.			
	Spiers, Ann, Vashon Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>If changes are made to the lagoon, King County should be willing to make a long-term commitment to maintenance and liability.</i>			
	Roberts, Annie, Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Over the past 15 years, there has been a significant degradation to the marine riparian vegetation buffer zone around Raab's Lagoon. This may have a greater impact on the health of the lagoon than the operation of the weir.</i>			
	Unknown	6-94	NS-64	<i>We see sea birds fishing in the lagoon</i>			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting			<i>so there must be fish using it now. Changing the existing lagoon management could change/harm the ecosystem.</i>			
	Holtz, Rayna, Vashon Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Management of the lagoon results in a tradeoff of use by different birds. Some bird species may not use it under certain conditions.</i>			
	Compton, Roger, Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Raab's Lagoon was significantly dredged and it will not be possible to restore it. The tide brings in a lot of detritus and red tide. Understanding how the tide works in this area would be essential to any changes.</i>			
	Unknown Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Involve the public (neighbors) in any decisions about changing the lagoon.</i>			
	Unknown Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Salmon do use the lagoon now.</i>			
	Unknown Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Possible changes to the lagoon should take into account the effect on adjacent properties. For example, would there be greater erosion?.</i>			
	Kanagy, Craig,	6-94	NS-64	<i>King County staff are welcome at any</i>			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting			<i>time to access the lagoon through my property for the purpose of study.</i>			
	Kanagy, Craig, Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Removal of the weir or any other changes will not be able use heavy equipment. I was not allowed to use heavy equipment to demolish a building in the buffer zone.</i>			
	Kanagy, Craig, Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>The lagoon has lots of marine life now including sea stars and sand dollars, suggesting that it is providing marine habitat. Keep water level to allow for boat moorage.</i>			
	Standley, Batoul, Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Important to maintain health and beauty of Raab's Lagoon. Want to help salmon but don't want it to become a smelly mudflat due to removal of weir. Any actions should respect wishes/concerns of neighbors around the lagoon.</i>			
	Jackson, Frank, Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-94	NS-64	<i>Plan should harness the collective thoughts of/Maury Island residents on Raab's Lagoon.</i>			
	Klemka, Donna, Vashon Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting	6-99	NS-Acquisitions	<i>Action should include easements and other incentives as alternatives to purchasing of unarmored shoreline.</i>			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	Gilbrough, Noel at 3/10/05 Steering Comm mtg	6-101		<i>Chapter 6.0 separates Ecosystem Restoration Projects (ERPs) from the main actions as if there are two classes of projects. Don't make the ERPs an add-on. If worthwhile, put into the main part of the plan. Have pictures, narrative, etc. Could asterisk these. They have been put through a full scientific review.</i>	substantive		
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	7-9	Table 7-1	Existing monitoring programs and their funding should be reorganized and refocused to what is needed before additional monitoring funding is provided, especially when it comes to cumulative effectiveness.			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	8-12	Table 8-2	A column needs to be added that shows the total projects cost, as a way to demonstrated how we have leveraged SRFB funds, and what the total dollar benefit to the WRIA has been			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	8-15	8-6 Cost of and Funding for Plan Implementation	The proposal to spend \$250 Million to \$678 Million over 10-years is unrealistic and too aggressive. It will set a false expectation to the public that we will not be able to achieve and the effort would be deemed a failure. The decision as to how much to fund and implement over the next 10-years has to be tied to the amount of funding available and the level of commitment			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				<p>from the all interested parties in WRIA 9 along with the state and federal government. Plan implementation goals have to be reduced to a more realistic and achievable target.</p> <p>Consider realistic goals for the first ten years, and discuss other projects that would be completed over the next 20-50 years.</p> <p>This is another point in the plan where we need to stress that funding partners other than just local government are critical to implementation.</p> <p>Finally, and perhaps most importantly, if this region spends this kind of money, there should be some recognition and waivers or at least reduction in the mitigation required by state and federal agencies on project permitting.</p>			
	Covington, Jay, City of Renton, 4/4/05	8-17		The idea of a watershed utility is certainly one to discuss, but it should not be included in this plan. It is extremely premature to be discussing this as the preferred alternative for funding. Frankly, the Steering Committee should be looking to the			

#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
				Forum for a recommendation.			
	Maury Island resident, 3/31/05 Vashon public meeting			<i>Education and stewardship recommendations should involve the public.</i>			
	Tibeau, Duane, mailed comments, received 3/30/05			Stop rewarding people for all the destruction they have caused to the land in this watershed. Quit paying them to get the land back. Take all necessary land back thru eminent domain laws.	editorial		
	Tibeau, Duane, mailed comments, received 3/30/05			It's going to take some very harsh laws to correct what humans have managed to destroy in the last 150 years.	editorial		
	Whitcomb, Janis, e-mail comment 3/10/05			I've lived on Newaukum creek for 15 years. I've seen what the creek does on its own in wet years and dry and I am totally against letting the county have any more control over my land than it already has. Isn't the CAO damage enough??  I know darn well that whatever you decide to do in reshaping the creek, the creek will just tear it out in a wet, high water year.			
	Parker, Martha, Renton resident, web survey			Don't kill paddlers in the Green River Gorge by feeding large trees from above the dam to the river above the			



#	Source of Remark List by last name of commenter (e.g., "Doe, John)	Page #	Action #	Remark Standard text = written comment <i>Italics = paraphrase of oral comment</i>	Comment Type • Editorial • Substantive	Staff Use (staff reactions/ plans on how to address comment)	Suggested Changes to Habitat Plan Page numbers in normal text refer to published <i>Draft</i> Habitat Plan dated March 2005 <b><u>Page numbers in bold/underline refer to revised Plan text dated XXXXXX.</u></b>
	9/17/04			Gorge. The Corps of Engineers and City of Tacoma say they must do that, and the Corps has already done it.			
	Tom Dean, Vashon-Maury Island Land Trust, 4/1/05 email			I would change the soft-armoring program into a house setback program. In other words, provide assistance to homeowners to move their homes back from the beach in order to avoid building or re-constructing seawalls or bulkheads.			